

MINUTES

CITY PLAN COMMISSION/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

JUNE 2, 2008

The City Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board of the City of Clayton, Missouri, met upon the above date at 5:30 p.m., Chairman Harold Sanger presiding. Upon roll call, the following responded:

Present

Chairman Harold Sanger
Steve Lichtenfeld, Aldermanic Representative
Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Acting City Manager
Jim Liberman
Debbie Igielnik
Marc Lopata
Scott Wilson

Absent:

None

Also Present:

Catherine Powers, Director of Planning & Development Services
Jason Jaggi, Planner
Kevin O'Keefe, City Attorney

Chairman Sanger welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked that conversations not take place during the meeting and that all cell phone and pager ringers be turned off. He announced that the RJ York Project proposal will be heard last, so as to get the remaining smaller projects out of the way first.

MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 19th, 2008 were presented for approval. The minutes were approved after having been previously distributed to each member.

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW – ADDITION TO SCIENCE BUILDING – FONTBONNE UNIVERSITY – 6800 WYDOWN

Mr. DeHekker, project architect, was in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance was Mr. Elmer Schneider representing Fontbonne University.

Catherine Powers explained that this is a request for a conditional use permit for expansion of the Science Building, including the construction of a second floor greenhouse. This

proposed addition was granted an 8.0-foot front yard setback variance by the Board of Adjustment on May 1, 2008. The project consists of an interior renovation and a three-story 6,180 square foot addition on the south side of the Science Building facing Big Bend Boulevard. The addition will contain restrooms, elevator and stairways on each floor, a small student lounge on first floor and a new green house on the second floor. The renovation will bring the building up to current building code requirements for fire safety and ADA compliance. According to the University, the current number of 13 classrooms will decrease to 10 classrooms after the addition is complete. Other uses of the renovated building include faculty offices, labs, and classrooms for the Science, Business Administration, and Human Environmental Sciences programs. The addition is relatively small and will follow the established setback of the existing Science Building. The number of classrooms is being reduced and the renovations will allow the building to meet current code requirements. The greenhouse will be more visible as a result of being located on the second floor. The University indicates that the hours of operation will remain the same, 8:00am to 10:00pm. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to recommend approval of the conditional use permit to the Board of Aldermen with the condition that hours of operation, including the greenhouse, conclude at 10:00 p.m.

Mr. DeHekker advised the members that the use of the building will remain the same and that there will be a net reduction of three classrooms as a result of this renovation.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to recommend approval of the Conditional Use Permit to the Board of Aldermen per staff recommendation. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the members.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed project consists of an interior renovation and a three-story 6,180 square foot, 44-feet in height addition on the south side of the Science Building facing Big Bend Boulevard to contain restrooms, elevator and stairways on each floor, a small student lounge on first floor and a new green house on the second floor. The renovation will bring the building up to current building code requirements for fire safety and ADA compliance. The exterior of the addition will contain red Missouri granite to match existing. The windows will be single hung dark bronze which will also match the existing building. The roof will be a black-colored membrane system. As part of the renovation, the Science building will contain central heating and cooling and, as a result, the window air conditioners will be removed. The new HVAC units will be located on the center of the roof and screened with metal panels. Catherine indicated that staff believes that this addition contains many of the details of the existing building and will match well. Due to the new HVAC system, the window air conditioners will be removed resulting in an improved appearance from the street. The building follows the existing setback along Big Bend and matches the height of the existing building. The greenhouse will be more visible on the second floor; however, the design is improved over the existing structure and staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. DeHekker indicated that the renovation will bring the building up to current Codes for fire safety and ADA compliance. A PowerPoint presentation was shown, with the first slide depicting a color rendering of the building after completion. Slides depicting floor plans were also shown. He stated that after completion, the building will tie into Ryan Hall via a covered walkway.

Chairman Sanger asked how long the building will be out of service.

Mr. DeHekker stated that the building will be partially occupied throughout construction.

Debbie Igielnik asked if the greenhouse is functional.

Mr. DeHekker replied “yes”.

Scott Wilson asked about the rooftop units.

Mr. DeHekker stated they will be in the middle of the building.

Marc Lopata asked why site plan review is not included as part of this project review.

Catherine Powers indicated that this is an extremely small addition and that site plan review is tied to size of construction.

A board containing various material samples was presented.

Marc Lopata asked if LEED Certification was considered.

Mr. DeHekker explained that the building will be sustainable to the fullest extent possible, including new insulation, mechanical equipment that exceeds requirements, high recycle content, etc. but they are not intending to do a formal certification.

Jim Liberman asked if they are removing the downspouts from the Big Bend elevation.

Mr. DeHekker replied “no”.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the single hung windows are all operable.

Mr. DeHekker replied “yes”.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the greenhouse will be operable.

Mr. DeHekker replied “yes”.

Mr. Tom Currier, 23 Wydown Terrace, asked that the rooftop HVAC units be re-visited. He asked how tall the units are.

Mr. DeHekker stated that he was not sure, although he believed them to be between 60 and 72” in height.

Mr. Currier commented that when Southwest Hall was renovated, the residents were assured that the units would be screened. He stated that is not so and that they are an eyesore. He stated he believes that as one drives down Big Bend, those units will probably be visible.

Catherine Powers stated that the units need to be fully screened and that the screen wall should go up the top of the units. She stated that requirement can be made part of the building permit.

Ms. Tamara Raven, Westmoreland resident, asked if a study was done as to the increased heat load in the area.

Mr. DeHekker stated that the project was designed as a long term investment to the University and that the dark roof is being replaced with a lighter color roof.

Chairman Sanger commented that it would be nice to do solar panels; however, this Board cannot legislate such.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve with the condition that the mechanical screening wall be raised so as to adequately screen the rooftop units. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board.

SITE PLAN REVIEW/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW - NEW CONSTRUCTION – SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCE – 319 N. CENTRAL AVE.

Mr. Dick Busch, project architect and Mr. Marc Berstein, owner, were in attendance at the meeting. Also in attendance was Dave Welton, Civil Engineer.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed project consists of a 2-story, approximately 33 feet in height, 5,060 square foot (excluding unfinished basement) brick and stucco single-family residence with a two-car side entry garage. The site is located in the R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District. The site measures approximately 13,899 square feet and is located in the North Bemiston subdivision. The R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District allows structures up to 35-feet in height. The R-3 One and Two Family Dwelling District allows up to 55% impervious coverage. The plans indicate that the existing impervious coverage is 4,206 square feet or approximately 30.3% of the site. The new plans show impervious coverage at 6,764 square feet or 48.7% of the site. A storm sewer is not located near the subject site. In lieu of a storm sewer connection, the applicant is proposing several storm water mitigation features. The site will contain two rain gardens (one in the front and one in the rear yard) which will collect surface run-off and water from the roof. The driveway will be constructed of pervious pavers to allow storm water infiltration. The property will be re-graded to lessen the slope and to assist with storm water run-off. The Public Works Department has reviewed this site plan and finds the storm water mitigation plans acceptable. Trash storage on the civil site plan is within an enclosure off the driveway and screened with a beige composite fence panel. The HVAC units are shown on the site plan along the north side of the house and screened with a composite lattice fence. The plan shows no trees on the site; however, based on a site visit by the city's contracted landscape architect several trees have recently been removed. The sizes of these removed trees are not known. For the purpose of determining caliper inch replacement, the landscape architect recommends that each of the five trees removed be valued at 12-inches a piece totaling 60 caliper inches. The applicant is proposing 72-caliper inches of trees which exceeds the estimated amount previously removed from the site. The landscape architect noted that the trees shown on the west end of the property are located in a swale and will need to be adjusted out of the swale. Catherine stated that the proposed residence is significantly larger

than the existing early 1900's structure. To mitigate this increase, the applicant is proposing several storm water best management practices including pervious pavers and two rain gardens. To assure the rain garden is installed correctly, staff recommends that two inspections be made by the City's contracted Landscape Architect at the applicant's expense. The two inspections should be made as follows:

1. The first inspection should verify the size of the rain garden, the rock material and the drain placement,
2. The second inspection should verify the soil content and depth and the plant material.

In addition, MSD requires the applicant to record a maintenance easement which will help ensure that these storm water features are maintained in the future. As previously indicated, a revised landscape plan must be submitted to staff which shows the plant material relocated out of the swale in the back yard. Any caliper deficiencies will require payment into the City's forestry fund. Staff believes the impervious coverage, storm water mitigation, and setbacks are in conformance with the R-3 One and Two Family Zoning Ordinance requirements and recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the applicant provide a revised landscape plan showing the relocation of plant material out of the swale and any caliper deficiencies will require payment to the City's forestry fund,
2. That the City's contracted Landscape Architect perform two inspections to ensure the proper construction of the rain garden system at the expense of the applicant;
3. That the applicant follow all MSD requirements pertaining to the proposed rain gardens and approval by the agency be granted prior to the issuance of a building permit.

Mr. Busch presented a site plan to the members and pointed out the location of the two rain gardens.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the rain gardens are designed to prevent water from going onto neighboring property.

Mr. Welton replied "yes".

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the pop-up along the north property line will go to the front.

Mr. Welton replied "yes". He stated there is also a swale to bring water to the front rain garden.

Scott Wilson asked if there is some overflow to the street.

Mr. Welton replied "yes".

Catherine Powers reminded everyone that there is no storm sewer available.

Marc Lopata asked what rainfall event the mitigation system is designed to accommodate.

Mr. Welton indicated that he does not know, but that run-off is only being increased by .03 cfs.

Marc Lopata indicated that he has issues with regard to the size of the house. He asked how there can only be a 61% increase in impervious coverage.

Mr. Welton reminded the members that the existing garage and driveway are being removed.

Catherine Powers then reminded the members that no credit is given for the use of pervious pavers.

Marc Lopata stated that there will be considerably more water runoff.

Mr. Welton indicated that rain gardens help hold/retain water.

Ms. Raven asked if the trees that were previously removed from the site were, in fact, 12” trees.

Mr. Busch stated that he did not know, because the trees had already been removed when he became involved with the project. He stated that he believes that they were actually smaller than 12”.

Chairman Sanger asked if some assumptions are being made with regard to those trees.

Catherine Powers replied “yes”. She stated that the City’s contracted landscape architect saw evidence that trees had been removed and that there was no way to determine their exact size.

Marc Lopata asked how they can be assured that there will be no additional water runoff.

Mr. Welton stated that with the installation of rain gardens and swales, the water will go to the rain gardens and then to the street, versus runoff onto the neighbor’s property.

Marc Lopata asked how the developer can state that there will be no run-off onto neighboring property if it is not known what rainfall event this system will handle.

Mr. Welton confirmed that is correct.

Being no further questions or comments, Debbie Igielnik made a motion to approve the site plan per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and received the following vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Steve Lichtenfeld, Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Jim Liberman, Debbie Igielnik and Scott Wilson. Nays: Marc Lopata.

The architectural aspects of the project were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that the proposed residence will be constructed of brick with stucco as a secondary material. In conformance with the Architectural Review Guidelines, the amount of stucco does not exceed 25% on any elevation. Windows will be casement; black in color. A side-entry two car garage is proposed. The driveway and turnaround is proposed to be pervious pavers with an exposed aggregate border. The color of the pavers has not been specified. The roofing material will be asphalt shingle; gray in color. Trash will be located in an enclosure off the driveway and screened with a composite fence material. The HVAC units are located on the side of the house and screened with a composite lattice fence. Catherine stated that staff believes the proposed residence is of high quality and is somewhat unique in that this property is wider than the adjacent properties and the garage is not street-facing. The streetscape drawing shows a newer 2 story residences with front entry garages on each side of the proposed house. Catherine indicated that staff recommends approval as submitted.

Mr. Busch presented a color rendering to the members. He explained that the home is primarily brick with some stucco accents and an asphalt roof. He stated that since the lot is wider, the house, too, is wider, but is close in size to other homes on the street. He indicated that there is only one garage (attached, side entry at the rear of the structure) and that the garage doors can't be seen from the street.

Elevation drawings were presented.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked about the trash enclosure material.

Jason Jaggi indicated that there is no regulation on the type of material to be used for trash enclosures, but he believes the material being proposed is a composite material and that the ARB can recommend the material as a condition.

Steve Lichtenfeld stated that it seems that a more natural material (i.e. wood) would be better to fit in with the quality of the house.

Mr. Busch indicated that they would be willing to use a wood enclosure.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the roof above the master bath is circular.

Mr. Busch replied "yes".

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that it looks like ridged shingles as opposed to round.

Mr. Bush indicated that it is round.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that it is a large, but nice looking home.

Jim Liberman asked that the streetscape drawing be shown again. He stated that he would have liked to see a more vertical design versus horizontal.

Marc Lopata asked if they would consider making this home Energy Star Certified.

Mr. Bernstein stated he would consider it.

Being no further questions or comments, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to approve with the condition that the trash enclosure be wood. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and received the following vote: Ayes: Chairman Sanger, Steve Lichtenfeld, Lenore Toser-Aldaz, Jim Liberman, Debbie Igielnik and Scott Wilson. Nays: Marc Lopata.

OUTDOOR SEATING – PACIUGO GRAN CAFFE – 173 CARONDELET PLAZA (THE CRESCENT)

Mr. Peter Edison, representing the restaurant owner who could not be here this evening, was in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers explained that the plans indicate that there will be 7 tables which will seat 20 patrons. Four smaller tables will be placed against the storefront providing seating for 8 patrons and three tables are proposed in between the street trees and the curb. The tables and chairs are black wrought iron. Two table sizes are proposed: 36-inch round tables seating four patrons and 24 x 30-inch tables seating two patrons each. Blue fabric 6-foot square umbrellas are shown on the plans for the larger tables. No pedestrian barriers are proposed. Catherine stated that staff is of the opinion that the sidewalk in front of The Crescent is wide enough to provide ample room for dining and pedestrian clearance; however, staff recommends that the 36-inch table and chairs near the curb should be eliminated. With this revision the proposed seating layout would be consistent with the previous approval for Kaldi's Coffeehouse. Due to the proposed layout, pedestrian barriers are not feasible at this location. Catherine indicated that staff's recommendation is to approve with the following conditions:

1. That the four-seat table shown near the curb be eliminated therefore reducing the outdoor seating capacity to 6 tables and 16 chairs,
2. That the umbrellas contain no logos or advertising,
3. That a 4-foot minimum pedestrian clearance be provided at all times,
4. That the applicant applies for the annual Outdoor Dining Permit showing the above conditions prior to operating the outdoor dining.

Mr. Edison commented that the sidewalk is very wide and that the extra table being requested is quite a distance from the curb.

Jason Jaggi advised the members that staff is aiming for consistency with Kaldi's outdoor dining and felt it best to keep the seating area confined between the trees so there are two areas to walk by the tables.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the Board. (Note that a pedestrian barrier is not required).

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (ENTIRE PROJECT)/SITE PLAN REVIEW (ENTIRE PROJECT)/ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW (GARAGE ONLY) – MIXED-USE PROJECT – 25, 103, 111 & 119 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE (RJ YORK PROJECT)

Robert Kramer (RJ York), Tyler Stephens and Michael Byrd (Core 10 Architecture) were in attendance at the meeting.

Catherine Powers provided the following information regarding the Planned Unit Development portion of the project, as taken from staff's memorandum. She noted that this item was continued from the April 21, 2008 Plan Commission meeting and that the plans have since been revised. She noted that the project meets the components of the Master Plan.

This project will be a hotel/residential/retail mixed-use project that will contain two components as follows:

The garage/retail building will be constructed first and will consist of a 6-level garage structure with three levels below grade and three levels above grade. The garage will contain 377 parking spaces; 72 spaces for public parking and 295 spaces for the hotel and retail parking use. Replacement of church parking will be shared with the hotel parking. The garage will be accessed from Central Avenue. This component will also include 16,538 square feet of ground floor retail/restaurant space. The retail and office portion will face Maryland Avenue.

Plans for the hotel consist of a 23 story hotel/condominium tower on the southwest corner of Central and Maryland Avenues. The hotel will provide 225 rooms, 10,500 square feet of meeting space, a 4,400 square foot restaurant, 5,580 square feet of ground floor retail, 3,100 square foot spa, and 180 square foot gift shop. This building also includes 40 condominium units. Eighty-five (85) parking spaces for the condominium units are located beneath the building.

COMPLIANCE WITH THE MASTER PLAN

This project is in compliance with the Business Districts Master Plan for Action Area #2 – Retail/Mixed-Use Core, as follows:

Future Function of Area:

To serve the retail and service needs of Clayton's residents, visitors and daytime employment population in a manner that addresses the street-level pedestrian environment.

Development Objectives:

- Retain and improve this area's pedestrian scale retail environment.
- Promote infill or new development that enhances the above objective.

- Retail/service uses on the ground level of buildings facing the street and extending to the sidewalk. This development could be new, rehab, or infill provided it conforms to and enhances the retail/mixed-use core's pedestrian environment.
- Upper levels may be mixed (office/residential/hotel).

Public Actions:

- Revise/update the C-4 Central Business District and related planning and design standards in the zoning code to provide guidance and incentives for the creation of an active and exciting street level shopping and pedestrian environment with offices, hotel and residential uses above.
- Strict code enforcement is needed to ensure the appearance, safety, and value of many of the aging structures and improvements in this action area.
- Streetscape/signage improvements.
- Provide tax and site consolidation incentives to achieve reinvestment objectives.
- Create a small pedestrian circulation plan which takes advantage of mid-block/alley walkways and other features that facilitate and encourage pedestrian traffic and exploration.

This project meets the objectives of the Master Plan by replacing an obsolete building and inefficient parking lots with a mixed-use project that provides additional parking and a pedestrian activity area, which will be located in front of the hotel on Central Avenue. The hotel and residential component meets the criteria of the “Development Objectives” which states that “Upper levels may be mixed (office/residential/hotel)”.

ZONING AMENDMENT

The Zoning Amendment to change the two northernmost parking lots from R-3 to C-2 received a unanimous vote from the Plan Commission at their March 3rd meeting. Additionally, the Plan Commission voted to recommend that the entire project site be rezoned to a Planned Unit Development District. Both re-zonings will be considered by the Board of Aldermen at a public hearing for final decision.

PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT

The Zoning Ordinance stipulates that Planned Unit Developments are a distinct zoning district. The Planned Unit Development district is intended to provide a means for the redevelopment of an area in a unified land development that will improve the quality of the subject properties and have a beneficial effect on adjacent residential areas.

This project meets the criteria for Planned Unit Development pursuant to Chapter 22 (Zoning Ordinance), Article 22 (General Commercial District), Section 22.9 (Planned Unit Development) as follows:

A development proposal shall be eligible for consideration under the Planned Unit Development option per the provisions of Article 12 when the development incorporates two of the following three categories of use:

- a) office use
- b) retail use
- c) residential use

and exceeds the maximum height or maximum FAR requirements of the C-2 District.

Although the garage does not exceed height or Floor Area Ratio (FAR), it is being considered as part of a total project which does exceed FAR and height.

The hotel portion of the project meets the criteria of Chapter 22A (Overlay and Urban Design Zoning Districts), Article 3a.5 (Planned Unit Development) as follows:

A development proposal shall be eligible for consideration under the Planned Unit Development option per the provisions of Chapter 22 when the development incorporates two of the following three categories of use:

- a) office use
- b) retail use
- c) residential use
- d) Public parking (as defined in these regulations)

and exceeds the maximum FAR requirements of the CBD Core Overlay District.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

This project seeks relief from Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and height. The base zoning maximum FAR for both the CBD Overlay and C-2 portions of the project is 1.5. The entire project, as proposed, has a FAR of 4.87.

The CBD Core Overlay District, which encompasses the hotel portion of the project, has a maximum height restriction of 4 stories. This height restriction may be waived through the Planned Unit Development Process; however, if height is waived, there must be 15 foot step-back at the third story or other step-back as approved by the Plan Commission. This project will require a PUD modification to build a 23-story structure; 18 stories higher than allowed by the underlying zoning. The project will also need a waiver from the rear yard setback requirement for the hotel.

The public benefits to the City that are intended to be derived from the approval of the development plan include, but are not limited to the following:

- Architectural distinction and significance that would make the development noteworthy;

- Extensive use of high quality building materials that would add significant value to the property and benefit adjacent properties;
- Provision of new public infrastructure including, but not limited to streets, curbs, sidewalks, sanitary sewers, storm water sewers, lighting and public parking;
- Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) certification from the U.S. Green Building Council to promote sustainable building design and construction including but not limited to, sustainable site development, green roofs, water savings, energy efficiency, materials selection, and indoor environmental quality.

For projects proposed within the Central Business District, the public benefits specific to the Central Business District that are intended to be derived from the approval of planned unit developments include, but are not limited to the following accessory complimentary features:

- Inclusion of below grade public parking facility located underneath the proposed development;
- Public art;
- Architectural distinction and significance that would make the building(s) noteworthy;
- Extensive use of high quality building materials that would add to the assessed valuation of the structure.

Staff is of the opinion that this project meets the above stated criteria and recommends approval of the Planned Unit Development with the following conditions:

1. That a plat and subdivision showing all boundary adjustments and revisions to public infrastructure be approved by the Plan Commission and Board of Aldermen when the timing is appropriate.
2. That streetscape is installed per City specification.
3. That curbs and crosswalks be designed per City of Clayton standards.
4. That all recommendations of the Traffic Study as contained in the Site Plan Review Memo be implemented.
5. That the developer work with the City's Art Commission to provide public art for the project. Such art is to be approved by the City's Architectural Review Board prior to installation and Occupancy Permits.
6. That Fire Department access and fire hydrant installation is resolved prior to Building Permit issuance.
7. That the developer commit to LEED Certification.

8. That the uses on the ground floor of the garage be restricted to sales tax producing retail or restaurant uses.

Chairman Sanger provided a brief overview, stating that the items for consideration this evening are the Planned Unit Development and Site Plan for the entire project and architectural review for the garage only.

Catherine Powers concurred.

Chairman Sanger asked Catherine to provide information regarding the proposed site plan.

Catherine Powers noted that some of the information contained in staff's memorandum regarding the landscaping was not correctly updated. She noted that bamboo is no longer being proposed.

Catherine indicated the subject property is zoned C-2 "General Commercial District. The first component of the project consists of a 377 space parking garage, accessed from Central Avenue and, 16,538 square feet of retail/restaurant space facing Maryland Avenue. The second component consists of a 23 story mixed use building featuring a hotel, 40 condominium units, ground floor retail, spa, meeting rooms and 85 parking spaces below grade. The current impervious coverage of the garage portion is 91.7% and the proposed impervious coverage is 83.7%, a decrease in impervious coverage with the new buffer. The current hotel site is 100% impervious and the proposed coverage is 100%. Drainage for the garage will be connected to the storm sewer on Central Avenue. The hotel will be connected to the storm sewer on Maryland Avenue. 53 caliper inches of trees will be removed and replaced by 54 caliper inches; mostly street trees at the garage location. 66.5 caliper inches of trees will be removed around the hotel location; 61.5 of these calipers are street trees. The applicant proposes to replace with 78 caliper inches. Street trees will be planted along Central and Maryland for the hotel portion and a hedge will act as screening for the hotel drop off turn around. A total of 377 parking spaces are proposed on-site. The parking garage will provide 77 spaces of public parking and 300 spaces in support of the hotel and retail elements. Additionally, 85 spaces are being provided in the hotel/residential building for the condominium units. HDR Engineering, Inc. performed a parking study and concluded that "the total number of parking stalls provided as part of this project should be sufficient to meet the needs of all parties." The parking scenario meets the Zoning Ordinance for uses. Staff concurs that the parking meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements and is adequate for the project. The developer has agreed to install streetscape per Public Works Standards. There will be a minimal negative impact on traffic as a result of this project per Crawford, Bunte & Brammeier (CBB) as follows:

"Once complete, the proposed development is anticipated to have a nominal impact on operating conditions."

The traffic study also considered the impact of traffic as a result of the project to the residential neighborhood to the north.

“The proposed development would add an additional 20 vph north on Central Avenue during both the morning and evening peak hours. The additional trips account for an approximate increase of 10% in traffic north along this section of Central Avenue. Consequently, the increase in traffic attributable to this development would not be significant and would have a nominal impact upon the residential neighborhood to the north of the CBD area.”

Additionally, the Traffic Study reviewed the Forecasted Operating Conditions and had the following comments and recommendations.

“Accordingly, the proposed entrance on Maryland Avenue (two lanes, one lane inbound and one lane outbound) was evaluated and was found to have acceptable levels of service when evaluated as an isolated intersection. However, it should be noted that the queues along Maryland Avenue that obstruct the current drive would remain and consequently, would cause delays for the site’s traffic to complete left-turns in/out of the site. As a means of reducing queuing on Maryland Avenue associated with vehicles turning left into the site, it is recommended that the valet employ an alternate route when returning to the hotel from the garage during peak times. Specifically, it is recommended that the valet proceed south on Central Avenue, make a right into the alley and continue to proceed around the block to the site entrance via a series of right turns. A review of the adjacent intersections indicates that there is ample capacity to accommodate the additional turning movements that would result from this route. Furthermore, this route would reduce queues and increase safety along Maryland Avenue during the peak periods.”

Finally, the Traffic Study considered on-site circulation and concluded that while none of the issues constitutes a major deficiency that alternatives and signage could be considered to ease confusion. The study pointed out that the larger delivery trucks will not be able to access the loading dock and that the size of the trucks will be limited to WB-40.

Catherine indicated that staff believes the site plan adequately handles drainage issues, ingress and egress situations and landscaping. The Traffic Study indicates nominal impact on traffic related to this project and recommends approval of the site plan with the following conditions:

1. MSD Approval of storm water mitigation.
2. Developer must install street trees per Public Works approval.
3. Other conditions as contained in the PUD Memo.
4. All mitigations recommended by the Traffic Study.

Mr. Kramer indicated that he has roots here in Clayton and that his company has done projects here. He stated that they have worked on this project for several years and has owned the land for over one year and that two of the lots are private and not for use by the public. He stated that he has met with City representatives several times and that the plans have been modified to accommodate the neighbors. He stated this project, which is in line with the Master Plan

components, will bring a public presence to this intersection and will benefit everyone. He reiterated that they are not interested in building the garage without the hotel. He indicated that World News will move into this location.

Mr. Stephens began a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that they have met with various groups throughout this process and that this is the third time this project has been before this Board, each time bringing changes. A slide depicting the subject sites and adjacent buildings was presented. He stated that the hotel building is the same size as Maryland Walk. He stated that the condominium owners' concerns of light, security and view are being addressed. He stated that this new proposal provides a 28 ½ foot beautifully landscaped area between the garage and the condo building to the north, whereas before, there was only 5 feet separating the two. He stated that most of the traffic will come from the west and that he does not believe that there will be more than four valets at any given time and that the alley has been widened, resulting in a 4' reduction in the building on all 23 floors. He stated that they believe that this block of Central has the best retail in the City and that this project will change its character, without losing it. He stated that there is 15 ½ feet between the curb and the building with a 12 foot high awning versus the other side which has 12 ½ feet between the curb and building and a 7 ½ foot high awning. He stated that they want life and activity to spill out onto the corner.

Slides depicting the proposed corner were presented.

Chairman Sanger thanked Mr. Stephens for the comprehensive presentation and for the changes that have been implemented.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the site plan covers the height and massing of the building.

Catherine Powers replied "yes".

Jim Liberman complimented Mr. Stephens for doing a good job with the garage by moving it further to the south.

Mr. Stephens stated that they still entertain the use of lights if the residents want them and that they are also willing to incorporate a fence if it is required.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there is an exit stair at the northwest end of the garage.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Catherine Powers reiterated that the proposal no longer includes bamboo.

Marc Lopata asked about parking.

Catherine Powers indicated that currently, the plan shows 82 extra spaces that will be dedicated to the City (to replace the current number of 43).

Marc Lopata asked if parking will be free during evenings and on weekends.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes”. He stated the rate will be the same as other City garages charge during the business day.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if there will be security on the west side of the property at the exit to Maryland.

Mr. Stephens stated that one cannot get down into the light well unless they access it from the garage. He stated that a green screen was installed at DeMun Pointe which cannot be walked through.

Steve Lichtenfeld referred to the Traffic Study and asked if the 10% increase is during the a.m. or p.m. peak hours or if it is spread throughout the day.

Catherine Powers indicated that the Study indicates the 10% increase is during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Jim Liberman asked if the increase stops at the markers.

Mr. Stephens replied “no”; he stated it goes into the residential area.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if any consideration was given to installing barriers to prevent no left turn from westbound Maryland.

Catherine Powers stated that would have to be discussed with the Public Works Department.

Mr. Stephens stated that barriers would not be aesthetically pleasing.

Steve Lichtenfeld agreed, but stated that the barriers would be used for safety reasons.

Kevin O’Keefe indicated that it is legal for the City to establish control methods, but liability issues would need to be considered.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if the parking meters on the south side are blocked.

Mr. Stephens advised the members that the Public Works Department asked that they be removed.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked how they get 5 lanes of traffic.

Catherine Powers stated that the Public Works Department wanted a more generous sidewalk.

Jim Liberman commented that they are losing 5 spaces.

Mr. Stephens stated that he believes there are only 3, maybe 4 spaces.

Marc Lopata asked about keeping construction waste out of the landfill.

Mr. Stephens indicated that there are some materials (i.e. drywall) that are impossible to keep out.

Jim Liberman asked if the retained water will be re-used.

Mr. Stephens indicated that they will do what MSD allows them to do and that they are looking at doing something creative with that water.

Mr. Claude Evans, 139 N. Bemiston, stated that he is impressed with the project's elegance, but that the height of the hotel is still inappropriate.

Ms. Rosemary Hardy, Clayton resident, asked if the classroom for the church has been removed from the plans.

Mr. Stephens replied "yes".

Ms. Laura Turner, 139 N. Central, asked about pedestrian access outside the entrance/exit to/from the garage.

Mr. Stephens stated that the sidewalk will work like any other sidewalk outside a garage entrance/exit.

Mr. Mike Marks, 207 Crandon, stated that the project benefits the church and that RJ York does quality work. He stated he recommended to the monsignor that the project be accepted.

Mr. Steven Schuver, 223 Lancaster, attested to RJ York's integrity and that he believes this project will benefit Clayton and will ease parking in the area.

Ms. Judith Glick, 149 N. Central, voiced her concern with regard to traffic. She stated that she would like to see a right only out of the garage and no parking in front of her house on weekdays from 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. and on Friday and Saturday evenings. She stated even with this project, people will still park on her street.

Chairman Sanger indicated that restricted parking has been discussed.

Mr. Gary Siegel, Clayton attorney, stated that this project is the next generation of buildings and that RJ York is committed to the community.

Mr. Jeff Michelson, Attorney with an office at 168 N. Meramec, stated that it seems as though Clayton has stopped building high quality hotels and that this hotel project is needed.

Mr. Martin Schneider, 6420 Ellenwood, stated that RJ York is sensitive to the neighbors and that he is very much in favor of the project.

Ms. Suzie Forsyth, 159 N. Central, stated that in 1987, a similar project was turned down. She asked that the project be confined to the City lot and their (RJ York's) lot only and not on one that encroached into their neighborhood. She asked how the church lot was made available.

Chairman Sanger indicated that the church sold their lot.

Msgr. John Shamleffer, St. Joseph's Church, stated it is the church's hope that this project will incorporate their needs with that of the City's and RJ York's. He stated he is not personally aware of a 1980's proposal and that their lot has not officially been sold to RJ York as of yet. He stated they are open to negotiations. He stated he has met with his parishioners and that they are in favor of communicating with RJ York about this project. He stated that he has received "nasty" e-mails indicating that they are not good neighbors. He stated it is his hope that the project will enhance the City and be favorable to the church's parishioners.

Ms. Forsyth stated that this project clearly encroaches into the neighborhood. She stated that the neighbors want the garage built on the two lots RJ York already owns.

Chairman Sanger commented that this project has received more exposure than other projects and that someone always feels "left out". He stated that the 1987 proposal called for the hotel on the north side of Maryland Avenue and was turned down because of such.

Mr. Ira Blake, Clayton Attorney with an office at 7701 Forsyth, stated that there is already a tall building at Brentwood and Maryland and that many times, his clients cannot get a hotel room in Clayton. He urged the City to move forward with this project.

Mr. Kerley, 139 N. Central, stated he believed that RJ York was a home builder. He questions if RJ York has the financial means to do this project.

Chairman Sanger indicated that it is not this Board's job to determine that.

Scott Wilson commented that the financial aspect is not relevant to these proceedings.

Mr. Jim Mellow, Attorney representing RJ York, commented that a group of outstanding developers are involved with this project.

Mr. Kerley stated that the Ritz is too expensive and he cannot believe that a hotel room will rent for less than \$200/night.

Ms. Susan Musgrave, 7744 Pershing, stated that the plan is good; however, she has traffic concerns for both the commercial and residential occupants of the area, especially in light of the fact that other large developments are coming to Clayton. She believes those other developments should be considered as well.

Chairman Sanger commented that traffic is very important.

Marc Lopata suggested implementing traffic cameras.

Mr. Shawn Canavan, 156 N. Bemiston, stated he believes the plan is great; however he, too, has concerns with traffic. He asked why there is not better police enforcement. He stated that he does support the project.

An unidentified individual asked why the 1 hour parking on North Central is not enforced. He stated that people would rather pay the \$5.00 parking fine issued by the traffic controllers than park where they are supposed to.

Note: Scott Wilson left the meeting (8 p.m.).

An unidentified Ladue resident, church parishioner, commented that it is a great development.

Ms. Terry Kerley, 139 N. Central, asked Mr. Stephens if there will be a garage attendant.

Mr. Stephens replied “yes, during the day”.

Mr. Mellow stated that if they could implement paid parking all the time, they could have an attendant 24 hours/day. He stated that the plan does not call for an attendant during the hours that no revenue is generated.

Mr. Stephens commented that with regard to noise, if the garage were to be enclosed, that additional mechanical equipment would be required and therefore, more noise.

Chairman Sanger stated that garage lighting has been discussed.

Mr. Stephens noted that the existing lots are lit.

Ms. Forsyth asked where the driveway is for the monsignor to park his car.

Mr. Stephens stated that there are a couple of options; that decision is up to the Public Works Director.

Ms. Paula McMaster, former Clayton residents, indicated her support of the project.

Mr. Matt Geekie, Counsel for Graybar Electric, stated that their concerns are far more serious than blocked views. He asked how many exceptions to the Master Plan are being made to accommodate this project. He stated that Il Vicino and San Sai would be surprised to hear that their buildings are dilapidated. He stated that this project will put a burden on Maryland Avenue traffic. He reiterated that Graybar remains opposed to this project. He stated that Graybar was never approached by RJ York with regard to this project.

Chairman Sanger commented that the areas above the restaurants are not in good shape.

Marc Lopata asked if exceptions to the Master Plan are being made.

Catherine Powers indicated that the Master Plan speaks to the area as a retail, mixed-use core, but that it does not speak to the area north of Maryland.

Ms. Kerley asked if the Master Plan indicates that it is alright to encroach into a residential area.

Ms. Kathy Beilein, 108 N. Bemiston, asked if retail on the north side fits in with the Master Plan.

Catherine Powers reiterated that the Master Plan does not speak to the north side.

Ms. Beilein indicated that her concern is what is being proposed north of Maryland and that the residents there should not be used as a transition area.

Chairman Sanger commented that the Plan does not speak against that, either.

Mr. Barry Adkin with Solon Gershman, indicated that the building above the retail is in deplorable condition and that the only way to make it viable is to tear it down.

Chairman Sanger stated that at this time, he will close the meeting to questions/comments. He stated that even though the parking lot is currently zoned R-3, it is being used as a parking lot. He stated that he supports the project, but does have concerns about traffic. He asked if Maryland Avenue is 4 or 5 lanes.

Jason Jaggi indicated that there are four through lanes with a center turning lane.

Chairman Sanger stated that he still has an issue with the way cars get in and out of the garage, but reiterated that he supports the project.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that this is the most critical juncture between a commercial and residential district in the City and that he has seen many modifications to minimize the impact on the residential neighborhood. He stated he agrees that traffic may be a problem and suggested a right turn prohibition entering from southbound Central Avenue as well as no left out of the garage onto northbound Central Avenue. He stated that he supports the project, but believes the intersections may be severely impacted.

Chairman Sanger advised the audience that the rezoning issue is a recommendation by this Commission to the Board of Aldermen, who make the final decision.

Jim Liberman stated that he would like traffic not to increase on northbound Central to lessen the impact on the residential neighborhood.

Chairman Sanger asked if this Commission can vote with the stipulation that there be no left turn out of the garage.

Catherine Powers indicated that that issue would have to be discussed with the Director of Public Works.

Chairman Sanger commented that the traffic issue needs more time and attention.

Mr. Stephens advised the members that the Public Works Director has already stipulated that only right turns may be made out of the garage.

Marc Lopata indicated that he and Scott Wilson are pleased with what the changes the developer has made since the original proposal and that they believe this has been an open process.

Chairman Sanger asked how they could continue.

Catherine Powers indicated that maybe the Commission would want to hold off on voting on the site plan.

Being no further questions regarding the Planned Unit Development, Steve Lichtenfeld made a motion to recommend approval of the Planned Unit Development to the Board of Aldermen per staff recommendations. The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the Commission.

Chairman Sanger asked what is recommended on how to proceed with the site plan issue.

Kevin O'Keefe indicated that it should not be approved with a fundamental issue still needing to be addressed.

Chairman Sanger commented that his concern is traffic flow from the hotel and from the garage.

Kevin O'Keefe indicated that in order to alter the traffic patterns, other things may need to be changed such as the road system, access points or intersections.

Chairman Sanger stated that his issue revolves more around functionality.

Kevin O'Keefe advised the members that adjoining streets are not subject to the site plan review and that he is not certain of the consequences of the issue is not resolved. He stated that staff cannot withdraw an approval once it has been made.

Steve Lichtenfeld asked if this Commission can recommend where traffic is channeled to avoid additional traffic on North Central, North Bemiston and Linden.

Kevin O'Keefe indicated that the City's Public Works Director addresses traffic.

Steve Lichtenfeld commented that if North Central were limited to southbound traffic only and that if right turns into the garage from southbound Central Avenue were prohibited, then traffic could not go north on North Central thereby resulting in less traffic. He also suggested prohibiting left turns out of the garage onto northbound Central Avenue.

Kevin O'Keefe reiterated that the City Engineer (Public Works Director) is the person who delegates authority to impose such restrictions.

Being no further questions or comments, Marc Lopata made a motion to approve the site plan per the following conditions:

1. MSD approval of storm water mitigation.

2. Developer must install street trees per Public Works approval.
3. Other conditions as contained in the Planned Unit Development memorandum.
4. All mitigations recommended by the City's Traffic Engineer.

The motion was seconded by Debbie Igielnik and unanimously approved by the members. (Note that the conditions of approval listed above are based on staff's recommendations with the exception of No. 4 which motion was revised to state "City's Traffic Engineer" versus "Traffic Study").

Chairman Sanger called for a 6 minute break at 9:00 p.m.

Note: Marc Lopata left the meeting (9:00 p.m.).

The meeting reconvened at 9:06 p.m.

The architectural aspects of the garage proposal were now up for review.

Catherine Powers explained that this phase of the proposed project will be located on property which currently contains the City's parking lot at 103 North Central, parking dedicated to the 25 North Central building at 111 North Central, and parking for the adjacent St. Joseph's Church at 119 North Central. She stated that on April 21, 2008 the Architectural Review Board voted to continue consideration of this portion of the project. Catherine stated that the Architectural review of the hotel structure will be held at a future meeting, pending additional design revisions. Catherine indicated that the proposed structure will measure approximately 39-feet in height from average existing grade to the top of the limestone façade. The parking garage portion of the building will be less in height, which staff estimated will be approximately 30-feet from finished grade to the top of the brick wall. Three levels of parking above grade are proposed with the remaining three levels placed below-grade. The garage will accommodate parking for 377 vehicles. The total square footage of the garage area is 166,582. Fronting Maryland Avenue will be a commercial component occupying two stories totaling 16,538 square feet. The exterior will contain two primary materials: limestone panels, and brick veneer. The limestone panels are proposed for the "front" of the building consisting of the commercial area. Storefront windows with large mesh fabric awnings are shown above the storefront entrances. The laminate rain screen panel presented at the conceptual review has been replaced with brick veneer. The openings of the garage will replicate windows on the east elevation. The plans show horizontal stone bands between each row of openings. The rendering indicates that cables will function as a vehicle stop mechanism; however, this detail is not shown on the elevation drawings. As currently shown, parked vehicles will be visible from Central and Maryland. The north elevation contains an additional 23.1 feet buffer which has been added to the north side resulting in a 28.5 foot green buffer between the garage and the condominium building at 139 North Central. On the west elevation, a brick veneer retaining wall is proposed to screen the garage ventilation wells; otherwise most of this elevation is open to allow for ventilation. A landscape buffer wall will be installed to screen this elevation; however, the wall does not cover the top section of the garage. A concrete barrier is proposed to screen the top parking level. The front of the elevation, which will be the most visible from Maryland, will contain primarily brick veneer with storefront windows at the corner. The applicant is proposing the installation of City

Streetscape along North Central and Maryland Avenues. In addition, a recessed patio area to be utilized for outdoor dining is proposed along Maryland Avenue. The actual garage building is now aligned with the monuments on North Central Avenue. Signage facing Maryland is shown in front of the awning mounted on a horizontal sign bar. This design is very similar to the existing signs on The Crescent mixed-use building. Signage is shown on the plans on the east and south elevations at the top of the third floor depicting an additional tenant. These signs have not been reviewed for compliance with the Sign Ordinance and should be considered as conceptual at this time. A sign package should be submitted for formal review and approval by the ARB at a later date. Catherine indicated that the portion of the garage structure facing Maryland represents an attractive design incorporating limestone panels and a patio area for use by the retail tenants. The revised design on the North Central elevation is an improvement from the last proposal. The additional buffer will help to mitigate the impact to the north and the landscape screening wall on the west side will reduce the impact of the open garage. Catherine stated that staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

1. That the landscape wall should be re-designed to meet the full height of the garage for review by staff and the City's contracted landscape architect.
2. That signage be approved by the Architectural Review Board as a Sign District.
3. That lights be shielded as shown on the plans.

Mr. Byrd presented slides depicting color renderings of the garage. Samples of the two colors of brick and cast stone were presented. He stated that there is a limit to how much vegetation can grow. He stated the Church is happy with the proposal.

Mr. Stephens advised the members that the green screen came up very recently and that the Church does not want a wall at all so they can use light from the light well. He stated the wall will most likely be removed when the Church comes forward with their plan.

Jim Liberman asked about the pattern on the retail portion of the building.

Mr. Byrd stated they do not want to over emphasize the horizontal bands.

Jim Liberman commented that the unusual pattern goes over to the hotel side.

A sample of the light blue awning material was presented.

Mr. Stephens stated that the brick is Jumbo brick (4 X 12) as was used on The Crescent.

Being no further questions or comments, Jim Liberman made a motion to approve the architectural aspects of the garage per staff recommendations 2 and 3 only. The motion was seconded by Steve Lichtenfeld and unanimously approved by the members.

Catherine Powers reminded the members of the special meeting on June 12th.

Being no further business for the Plan Commission/Architectural Review Board, this meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Recording Secretary